

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application; reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

1. Claims 1-6 were rejected as anticipated by Schoolcraft. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner cited col.8, ln.65 to col.12, ln.3 for step (b) computing differentials and Table III for the step (f) inner product of the ordered differentials with the differences of vertices.

Applicant replies that Schoolcraft Table III does not suggest an inner product of the differentials in size order with the corresponding differences of vertex outputs. Rather, Table III just lists the six possible relative sizes of the three differentials and the corresponding interpolation in terms of an inner product of differences of differentials with vertex outputs; that is, Table III has differences of differentials, whereas the claim is differences of vertex outputs. Further, Schoolcraft FIG.8 computes the differentials in step S807, but then computes the entries in the temporary lookup Table V in step S808 without any differential size ordering, and computes the index in step S809, etc. This does not suggest claim 1.

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner noted that claim 6 is a device claim corresponding to method claim 1 and analyzed similarly.

Applicant relies upon the foregoing argument with regard to the patentability of claim 1 that Schoolcraft does not suggest the sorting of the differentials in size order.

Consequently, Schoolcraft does not suggest any of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carlton H. Hoel/

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365